



County of Los Angeles  
**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE**

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://cao.lacounty.gov>

DAVID E. JANSSEN  
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE  
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

January 9, 2007

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: David E. Janssen  
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "DJ", is written over the name "David E. Janssen" in the "From:" line.

**REPORT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE**

My office convened a meeting of the Infrastructure Task Force on December 18, 2006 pursuant to a December 5, 2006 Board Motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Yaroslavsky. The meeting was attended by representatives of the Departments of Beaches and Harbors, Parks and Recreation, Public Works, and Regional Planning in addition to the Community Development Commission, and the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

**Critical Elements of the Strategic Plan**

Discussions with Infrastructure Task Force participants emphasized the potential benefits to be gained from a Strategic Plan (Plan) that includes a range of advocacy approaches including outreach to members of the County delegation and key Administration officials and agency heads, coalition building, and alliances with traditional local government partners.

**Analysis of Bond Propositions**

In furtherance of the Plan, each department, working with its CAO counterpart, is to develop a chart with a narrative identifying the amount of money that is subject to legislative allocation with recommendations for the type of guidelines, criteria, and formulae that will maximize County opportunities for funding.

Various sections in Proposition 1B, for example, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, totaling approximately \$5 billion will be allocated "subject to such conditions and criteria as the legislature may provide by statute." The categories include the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (\$2 billion), State Air Resources Board, emission reductions related to movement of freight along trade corridors (\$1 billion), State Local Partnership Program (\$1 billion), and Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response (\$1 billion).

Similar language appears in Proposition 1C, the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006. The amount subject to legislative discretion exceeds \$1 billion and consists of \$100 million for an Affordable Housing Innovation Fund, \$850 million for a Regional Planning, Housing and Infill Incentives Account, and \$200 million for a Housing Urban-Suburban and Rural Parks Account.

Finally, Proposition 84, the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Act of 2006 contains almost \$700 million in various accounts that are subject to legislative purview. There are matching grants to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams (\$90 million), urban greening (\$90 million), competitive grants for local and regional parks (\$400 million), and planning grants and planning incentives (\$90 million).

Departments also were asked to provide information on how the Legislature has allocated the funds in the past. In some cases, the Legislature merely incorporated guidelines developed by State agencies or departments. At other times, project funding and criteria were based on guidelines that were part of previous bond acts, existing statutory formulas, or distributed on a per capita basis. Finally, departments also were asked if the inclusion of additional criteria would benefit the County and whether the County benefited from the language of prior distributions.

Other parts of these same bond acts are largely outside of legislative purview as is Proposition 1E, the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006. In many cases, funds are allocated according to existing statutes and the Legislature appropriates according to the formulae and criteria contained in these laws. In other cases, the funds are continuously appropriated to a State agency or department for specified purposes. In addition, State departments, such as the Department of Water Resources and Caltrans have been holding stakeholder hearings to discuss appropriate guidelines for bond funds specifically allocated to the agency with the provision that criteria be developed in consultation with affected groups.

Finally, Proposition 1A is not a bond act. It limits the ability of the Legislature and the Governor to divert Proposition 42 transportation funds. Similarly, Proposition 1D, the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006, does not contain any allocations to the County nor is it subject to legislative allocation according to the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

### **County Priority Projects, Cost Estimates, and Timelines for Implementing Projects**

Last year, each department went through a process of developing project lists and clearing them with each Board Office. Departments will be meeting with your offices to discuss district priorities and to ensure that the projects are feasible in terms of estimated overall funding requirements and operational funding needs, and are able to overcome any regulatory and financial barriers that would prevent a department from submitting a timely application.

### **County Advocacy**

The goal of the Plan is an equitable allocation of bond funds to ensure that the County receives the maximum amount of funds permitted with the constraints of each bond measure. This will be accomplished through the enactment of legislation which contains equitable allocation criteria or by working with the appropriate State agencies and departments to bring about the same result. It will also include the modification or defeat of bills that do not contain criteria that allow County departments to compete effectively across an array of funding categories.

County advocacy efforts will be tailored to each specific funding opportunity or circumstance. For example, where a Proposition specifically delegates authority for the allocation of bond funds "subject to such conditions and criteria as the legislature may provide by statute", then the County will identify key legislators, committee chairs, and legislative leadership from the County delegation to pursue enactment of guidelines and criteria favorable to the County. Conversely, if primary responsibility for allocation is left to State departments and agencies, advocacy will be geared toward the Administration. In all of these efforts, the County will employ direct advocacy and enlist the support of similarly situated interest groups and stakeholders.

These guidelines and criteria will be developed, discussed, and refined in departmental meetings with Board Offices to put together project priority lists and appropriate legislative language. It is particularly important that these discussions take place as early as possible so that the resources of our Sacramento advocacy office can be employed effectively early in the Legislative Session.

Each Supervisor  
January 9, 2007  
Page 4

Our Sacramento advocates will then be able to respond to requests from County delegation members for ideas and recommendations for County project funding based on the priority lists and project criteria. They also will gather intelligence from legislative and Administration sources and especially from the leadership of both Houses and will also contact the Governor's Office and arrange meetings for department heads with key legislators and committee chairs and identify appropriate committee meetings where County representatives can provide testimony. Where appropriate, the County will work in partnership with the California State Association of Counties, the Urban Counties Caucus, County Employee Unions, individual counties, and other interests that share the County's objectives. In addition, the County's weekly Legislative Working Group meeting will be used to share intelligence, communicate recent Sacramento developments to the Board, and solicit the Board's assistance in targeted advocacy and discussion of County strategies and tactics.

If you have any questions, please contact Marshall Langberg of my staff at (213) 974-1114, or at [mlangberg@cao.lacounty.gov](mailto:mlangberg@cao.lacounty.gov).

DEJ: GK:MAL  
MR:EW:LY:hg

c: Each Supervisor  
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors  
County Counsel  
Beaches and Harbors  
Community Development Commission  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Parks and Recreation  
Public Works  
Regional Planning



# County of Los Angeles **CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE**

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://cao.lacounty.gov>

DAVID E. JANSSEN  
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District


YVONNE B. BURKE  
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

April 3, 2007

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman  
Supervisor Gloria Molina  
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich  
From:   
David E. Janssen  
Chief Administrative Officer

## **REPORT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE**

On December 5, 2006, the Board adopted a motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Yaroslavsky directing the Chief Administrative Office (CAO) to establish an Infrastructure Task Force comprised of the CAO and the Departments of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Regional Planning, Beaches and Harbors, and other relevant Departments. The motion included instructions to analyze the recently passed infrastructure bond initiatives, identify the County's priority projects eligible for funding through the bonds, develop cost estimates and timelines for implementing these projects, and create a strategic plan to direct the County's efforts to apply for and receive bond funding for these projects. The Task Force was directed to report back by January 9, 2007 and periodically afterwards as necessary.

The initial meeting of the Infrastructure Task Force took place on December 18, 2006 with representatives from all the appropriate departments in attendance. Each department committed to prepare detailed analyses of the bond propositions and to identify the priority funding sources and funding criteria to be pursued by our Sacramento advocates. Departments also were asked to designate those sections of the various bond acts that should be amended through legislation to enhance the probability that County projects will be able to compete effectively for funding. Participants agreed that these analyses would be the key to identifying appropriate projects to submit for funding to administrative agencies and creation of a strategic plan.

## **Infrastructure Task Force Report of January 9, 2007**

The January report set out the critical elements of a strategic plan that would include a range of County advocacy approaches which will be tailored to each funding opportunity or circumstance. In the case where a Bond Proposition specifically delegated authority for the allocation of bond funds "subject to such conditions and criteria as the legislature may provide by statute", our Sacramento advocates will identify key legislators, committee chairs, and legislative leadership from the County delegation to pursue enactment of guidelines and criteria favorable to the County. If primary responsibility for allocation is left to State departments and agencies, County department efforts will be focused on developing funding criteria and guidelines with Administration agencies and departments.

At the same time departments were working to identify funding sources and allocation criteria, they indicated that they were beginning to work with your Offices to identify district priority projects consistent with their analyses of the bond initiatives and the extensive project lists cleared with each Board Office last year. These priority projects are to be feasible in overall funding requirements, cost estimates, operational needs, completion dates, and consistent with existing policies and the strategic plan.

### **Additional Task Force Activities**

Over the last month, individual meetings were convened with each department to discuss funding pools, allocation criteria, and potential amendments. The meetings were essentially discussions between the departments and our Sacramento advocates about projects and appropriate strategies and amendments to guide our advocacy efforts. Each infrastructure priority and related departmental concerns are discussed in the attachment. The priorities are organized by department, funding source, allocation criteria where appropriate, and advocacy approach. Two funding sources are of interest to the Sheriff and they are noted in the attachment.

In general, the departments support:

- Favorable allocation formulas that rely on previous bond acts where appropriate;
- Targeted infrastructure funding to the highest priority need in urban areas;
- Expansion of recreational facilities in underserved urban park areas;
- Guidelines that are favorable to the expansion of affordable housing within an urban environment;
- Allocation of certain transportation funding based on population;
- Simplification of the Integrated Regional Water Management grant process;

- Adoption of guidelines for competitive grants that include realistic timeframes for eligible project submission and the expenditure of allocated program funding;
- Expanded eligibility for various funding; and
- Multi-departmental projects under various provisions of Proposition 84, the Clean Water, Parks and Coastal Protection Act.

The priorities identified by departments are consistent with County policies to maximize funding. They are also consistent with County policy to support funding or legislation to: maintain clean beaches and improve the water quality of coastal waters, maintain natural resource areas and riparian corridors, promote the preservation and restoration of watershed, river and wetland areas, acquisition, development, and rehabilitation of parks and recreation areas, establish new urban parks in the underserved areas of the County, operate State park units, foster partnering opportunities with social service and health agencies and after-school programs, develop projects that link watershed management, environmental protection, recreation, open space and beach improvements, river and stream education and interpretive facilities, and ensure the direct allocation of funds to local governments for the preservation of local streets and roads.

Based on departmental support for various priority funding sources and criteria as outlined in the attachment, and existing County policies, departments will continue to work with Board Offices to select priority projects for grant submission.

Since the initial meeting of the Task Force, more than 50 bills have been introduced in the 2007-08 Legislative Session which address eligibility criteria and the allocation of bond funds. In addition, it is possible that budget trailer bill language will be developed to establish eligibility and allocation criteria for bond funds as well. Our overall strategy will be to aggressively influence eligibility criteria and guidelines for the distribution of funds, along with submitting projects that maximize the County's immediate opportunities for State funding from the various bond acts. Based on the funding sources identified by departments and funding criteria developed in collaboration with my office which are consistent with County policies, our Sacramento advocates and affected County departments will monitor, analyze, and support amendments and legislation which maximizes County funding opportunities.

Our Sacramento advocates and County departments will work to communicate the County's interests to key legislators and Administration officials. Direct advocacy will be employed in all of these efforts and we will enlist the support of similarly situated interest groups and stakeholders.

Each Supervisor  
April 3, 2007  
Page 4

If you have any questions, please contact Marshall Langberg of my staff at (213) 974-1114, or at [mlangberg@cao.lacounty.gov](mailto:mlangberg@cao.lacounty.gov).

DEJ:GK  
MAL:acn

#### Attachment

c:     Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors  
         County Counsel  
         Beaches and Harbors  
         Community Development Commission  
         Parks and Recreation  
         Public Works  
         Regional Planning



## DEPARTMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES

### Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)

#### Proposition 84

Priority Funding Sources. The department identified a number of priority funding sources totaling \$980 million for local projects under Proposition 84 including;

- State Parks system: \$400 million.

**The department supports \$20 million in funding for State Recreational Areas which are operated by local government including Castaic Lake, Kenneth Hahn, and Placerita Canyon.**

- Urban water and conservation planning grants for urban greening programs: \$90 million.
- Local and regional parks competitive grant program: \$400 million.
- Planning grants and incentives to include conservation in local planning: \$90 million.

Funding Criteria. For each of these sources, the department will work with our Sacramento advocates and affected interest groups to **seek amendments that would condition competitive grant allocation on the basis of allotment principles contained in previous bond acts such as Proposition 12, the Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000 and Proposition 40, the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2002.** At other times, our Sacramento advocates will coordinate with DPR to develop other formulae to enhance the County's receipt of its fair share of bond funding.

The department also recognized an additional funding opportunity of \$200 million in Proposition 1C funds which can be used for housing-related parks grants in urban, suburban, and rural areas. This section does not assign responsibility for allocation to a specific State agency or department, as noted by the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) in its report on "Implementing the 2006 Bond Package". The LAO recommends that these funds be administered by the State Department of Parks and Recreation. **DPR supports this recommendation.**

Finally, DPR designated other categories of potential direct or indirect funding. The Department indicates that it would be eligible for grants under the Urban Streams Restoration Program (\$18 million) and could benefit indirectly from the separate \$36 million grants to the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles River and Mountains Conservancy and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. It would also be eligible for funding that promotes the recovery of threatened and endangered species or promotes riparian and wetland areas. Other areas include funding for nature education and research facilities and botanic gardens, natural resources conservation, river parkways, watershed management, and prevention and reduction of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes and streams. Many of these categories also were identified by the Department of Public Works.

Based on these funding opportunities and proposed selection criteria, our Sacramento advocates will work with the County Department of Parks and Recreation to **target infrastructure funding to the highest priority need in urban areas, the expansion of recreational facilities in underserved urban park areas, joint use projects with schools that meet the needs of urban park areas with low income levels, and State park units operated by the County.**

Advocacy materials will be based on DPR's adopted Strategic Asset Management Plan for 2020 which indicates that the Department provides 558 acres of local parkland for the residents of the County. Based on a County General Plan standard of four acres of local parkland per 1000 County residents, there is a deficiency of 4,618 acres, 88 percent short of meeting the 2020 standard. This parkland deficiency is distributed fairly evenly throughout the County and, therefore, it may be important strategically, to select a signature project(s) from each district and seek amendments incorporating appropriate criteria that match the characteristics of these projects.

### **Community Development Commission (CDC)**

#### **Proposition 1C**

Priority Funding Sources. CDC identified four funding sources in Proposition 1C which would indirectly enhance its ability to provide housing assistance, promote community and housing development and preservation, and encourage economic redevelopment. They are:

- Affordable Housing Innovation: \$100 million.
- Regional Planning Housing and Infill Incentives: \$850 million. Of this amount, \$200 million is for park creation, development, or rehabilitation to encourage infill development. The remaining \$650 million may be used for water, sewer or other public infrastructure costs associated with infill development, transportation improvement related to infill development projects, traffic mitigation, or for Brownfield cleanup that promotes infill housing development.

- Housing and Urban-Suburban and Rural Parks: \$200 million.
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD): \$300 million.

Funding Criteria. With the exception of the TOD, the decision on how to allocate these funds is subject to the conditions and criteria that the legislature may provide in statute.

In addition, the Affordable Housing Innovation funds criteria must be approved by a 2/3 vote of both houses. CDC is currently drafting legislative language to ensure that these funds can be used to leverage additional resources. **CDC supports local control of the distribution of Proposition 1C funds.**

Based on these funding opportunities and proposed selection criteria, our Sacramento advocates will work with the Community Development Commission to **support targeted housing and infrastructure funding to expand affordable housing under guidelines that are favorable to an urban environment and leveraging locally utilized resources, supportive housing for individuals and households moving from emergency shelters or transitional housing or those at risk of homelessness, expand emergency housing, infill development park creation and the availability of down payment assistance.**

#### Department of Public Works (DPW)

Priority Funding Sources. The department identified several funding pools within Propositions 1B, 1E, and 84 to enhance their ability to improve transportation, flood control, and water quality and safety in the County. Each bond is discussed below.

#### **Proposition 1B: Funding Criteria Subject to Legislative Discretion**

Proposition 1B provides \$19.925 billion in funding of which \$5.1 billion is subject to potential legislative specification of additional criteria. The categories are:

- The State-Local Partnership Program which requires a dollar for dollar match: \$1.0 billion for grants for locally funded transportation projects.

**DPW supports allocation on a formula based on population and funneled through regional transportation planning agencies to ensure the County receives a fair share of these funds.**

- Improve movement of goods on State highways and rail system, and in ports: \$2.0 billion.
- Reduce emissions from goods movement activities: \$1.0 billion.

Caltrans guidelines for these funding sources are scheduled for release in April 2007 and DPW will assess their potential impact on the County and work with our Sacramento advocates to seek legislative amendments where appropriate. DPW supports including grade separation projects as eligible for funding from this category.

- Improve security and disaster response of transit systems: \$1.0 billion.

The Sheriff supports funding for additional cameras and global positioning devices for MTA rail and bus lines. He also supports establishment of a training facility to develop plans for emergency evacuation of buses and rail centers. Finally, he supports setting up a State Emergency Operations Center in Southern California to provide training for emergency disasters.

- Grants to improve security and facilitate disaster planning in publicly owned ports, harbors, and ferry facilities: \$100 million.

The Sheriff supports funding for anti-radiation equipment and metal detectors for use in the Marina and Catalina.

#### **Proposition 1B: Funding Subject to Existing Formula or Development of Administrative Guidelines**

In addition, there are other funding sources where the Legislature's discretion is limited, or DPW supports existing allocation formulas, or DPW is waiting for guidelines to be issued.

- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) augmentation: \$2.0 billion.

DPW supports the STIP process because 75 percent of the funding is allocated to existing regional transportation planning agencies for regional transportation improvements and further allocated to counties based on statutory formula. The Los Angeles Region will be eligible to receive \$345 million which will be used by METRO to fund regional transit projects.

- Local streets and roads – counties: \$1.0 billion.

The Governor's Office issued an Executive Order on January 24, 2007, which may mandate that DPW's projects meet extensive requirements similar to large freeway projects. DPW indicates that this funding was to be a direct allocation to local agencies but the Executive Order requires submittal of project lists for State approval, semi-annual status updates, and follow-up reports upon completion. **Therefore, DPW supports legislation to clarify that these funds should be allocated to cities and counties on a formula basis without extensive oversight by the State.**

- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP): \$750 million.

The bond provides \$250 million of the \$750 million to be allocated to fund Traffic Signal Synchronization/ITS projects on local streets and roads. Caltrans is currently preparing draft guidelines which DPW will evaluate when they are released. **DPW will coordinate with our Sacramento advocates to secure funding for County projects.**

- Grade separations: \$250 million.

DPW indicates that the County could receive approximately \$35.5 million from this program.

- Local bridge seismic retrofit: \$125 million.

DPW is actively participating in the development of draft guidelines which will be considered by the California Transportation Commission in April 2007. **DPW indicates that the County could receive approximately \$29 million under this program.**

### **Proposition 1E**

Priority Funding Sources. Proposition 1E provides funding in a number of categories for which DPW may be eligible to apply. In each case, fund usage is controlled within the bond act. The potential funding categories are:

- State's share of costs for locally sponsored, federally authorized flood control projects outside the Central Valley system: \$500 million to local governments.

DPW indicates that they will be eligible to receive up to 60 percent flood control subvention funding for the Los Angeles County Drainage Area (LACDA) project once the State certifies it as a multi-use project in compliance with AB 1147, Statutes of 2000. DPW and staff from the State Department of Water Resources (DWR) met in Los Angeles the week of February 19, 2007 on project certification. DPW anticipates receiving approximately \$35 million.

- Protection, creation, and enhancement of flood protection corridors, bypasses and flood plain mapping: \$290 million.

DPW is waiting for the State to develop guidelines and will be submitting suggestions for policies and guidelines prior to DWR issuing draft guidelines. **DPW supports addressing the issue of liability for local agencies during this process.**

- Storm flood management grants to local agencies outside the Central Valley system: \$300 million.

DPW is currently working with the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to enlist support for funding of the Big Tujunga Seismic Mitigation and Stormwater Flood Protection Project.

## Proposition 84

Priority Funding Sources. Proposition 84 provides funding in the following categories for which DPW may be eligible to apply. Our Integrated Regional Water Management Plan projects which include Los Angeles and San Gabriel River Master Plan projects, and projects developed to comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads should be eligible for various Chapters in this Proposition but we will not know the specific projects that we will submit until the final guidelines are developed. The Antelope Valley's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan is expected to include projects to improve water supply reliability.

- Chapter 2. Safe Drinking Water and Water Quality Projects: 242 million (\$215 million for Los Angeles/Ventura/Upper Santa Clara Funding Area and up to \$27 million for North/South Lahontan which includes the Antelope Valley) for Integrated Regional Water Management and Water Quality.

DPW is currently preparing comments regarding the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) program for the State to consider in their development of grant guidelines and distribution of funds and comments on the State's proposal to combine the remaining Proposition 50 funds and Proposition 1E funds with the Proposition 84 IRWM Program funds. **DPW supports the State's proposal to administer future IRWM grant program funds with a single application process to enable the State to administer funding programs more efficiently.**

In addition, a total of \$215 million is dedicated to the Los Angeles Funding Area, which includes the Greater Los Angeles Region, Ventura County, and Upper Santa Clara IRWM sub-regions. The State is working on guidelines and soliciting input from the three sub-regions within the funding area.

A total of \$27 million is dedicated to regions in the North/South Lahontan Funding Areas, which include the portion of the Antelope Valley in Los Angeles County. A regional plan must be developed prior to receiving funds. On April 3, 2007, DPW, on behalf of the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40, Antelope Valley, will meet with the California Department of Water Resources and other regions from North/South Lahontan to discuss potential mechanisms to distribute Proposition 84 funds that are allocated to this hydrologic region identified in the bond act. Currently, the primary concern is that the allocation of funds to the hydrologic region is very small compared to the expected future population of the region. The allocation of funds to hydrologic regions in the bond act appears to have been based roughly on current population and did not take into account expected growth rates.

- Chapter 3. Flood Control: \$275 million for various types of flood control projects including a multi-objective approach that would not be limited to ecosystem restoration and increased flood protection, \$30 million for flood plain mapping and reducing flood risks, and \$180 million to fund the State's share of the

nonfederal costs of flood control and flood prevention. There also is \$40 million for Flood protection Corridor Projects that we may be eligible to receive.

DPW indicates that there is potential funding available for flood plain management and flood control improvements projects and **supports County advocacy of a “fair share” for Southern California. This chapter could be an additional source of LACDA reimbursement.**

- Chapter 4. Statewide Water Planning and Design: \$65 million for planning and feasibility studies related to future water supply, conveyance and water control systems.

According to DPW, there is potential funding for the County's Waterworks Districts, multi-use flood protection projects and enhancements of the existing Greater Los Angeles Region IRWMP and development of the Antelope Valley IRWMP and the Upper Santa Clara River IRWMP.

- Chapter 5. Protection of Rivers, Lakes and Streams: \$90 million to the State Water Resources Board for matching grants to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes and streams. This source also is mentioned by DPR.

DPW indicates that the Los Angeles River Master Plan Advisory Committee is looking at policy changes to be incorporated into budget trailer bills affecting the Department of Water Resources Urban Streams and Restoration Program and the Resources Agency California River Parkways Act of 2004. In each of these programs, DPW will develop guidelines and allocation methodologies to ensure that their projects are viewed favorably. **Therefore, DPW supports inclusion of these items in budget trailer bills. DPW also will work with our Sacramento advocates to develop legislative implementation language for the section on storm water contamination.** This money also could be used for both the Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River Master Plans projects and other TMDL water quality projects.

**DPW also should be eligible for Urban Streams Restoration money depending upon the criteria. In the past, State grant reviewers rejected their applications because DPW was not removing concrete. The Southern California Conservancies have been working to change this perception. The County's Sacramento advocates will work with DPW to support these efforts.** Otherwise DPW would indirectly benefit from the money provided to the local conservancies, especially those with which we have JPA's, such as the River and Mountains Conservancy and Santa Monica Bay.

- Chapter 6. Wildlife and Forest Conservation: \$135 million.

DPW does not have any projects that fit this category currently.

- Chapter 7. Protection of Beaches, Bays and Coastal Waters: \$90 million.

DPW indicates that the State Water Resources Control Board is the agency identified to administer \$90 million for matching grants to protect beaches and coastal waters from pollution and toxic contaminants pursuant to the Clean Beaches Program. **DPW assumes that this funding will be distributed on a competitive basis. Since we would need the funding mostly for TMDL compliance, DPW supports adding compliance as a funding criterion.**

- Chapter 8. Parks and Nature Education Centers: \$100 million for grants for nature education and research facilities and equipment to nonprofit organizations and public institutions. This source also is mentioned by DPR and the Department of Beaches and Harbors.

DPW indicates that the DPR would benefit directly from this Chapter, but other departments such as DPW could partner with Parks on projects of mutual benefit. This funding source is in addition to those identified by DPR earlier. **Where it is appropriate, DPW and DPR will work with our Sacramento advocates to develop multi-departmental projects for presentation to the State Department of Parks and Recreation.**

- Chapter 9. Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Reduction: \$180 million. There are two sources of funding. Each is \$90 million and each is subject to enactment of implementation legislation. The first is for urban greening projects with priority given to those that provide multiple benefits, serve communities with the greatest need, and facilitate joint use of public resources and investments including schools. The second funding source is for planning grants and incentives to promote water conservation, reduce automobile use and fuel consumption, and revitalize urban community centers among other uses. This source also is mentioned by DPR.

DPW indicates that, depending on the guidelines, some Los Angeles River and San Gabriel River Master Plan Projects and Antelope Valley water conservation projects should be eligible for funding. DPW will make a decision on which of their projects can be submitted under the “urban greening” category. **DPW will collaborate with other County departments and our Sacramento advocates to seek appropriate legislative language to maximize funding opportunities.**

#### **Department of Beaches and Harbors (DBH)**

#### **Proposition 84**

Priority Funding Sources. The Department has identified the following sections, under Proposition 84, as potential funding sources totaling \$817 million.



- California Rivers Parkway Act of 2004 to improve public access adjacent to rivers and streams: \$72 million.
- Clean Beaches Program for matching grants for protecting beaches and coastal waters from pollution and toxic contamination: \$90 million. DPW also cites this as a source of funding.
- State Coastal Conservancy for general beach improvements including associated infrastructure: \$135 million.
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy to protect water quality in the Santa Monica Bay and its watershed: \$20 million.
- Parks and Nature Education Facilities: \$500 million. There are two separate funding sources. The first consists of \$400 million to the State Department of Parks and Recreation for development, acquisition, interpretation, restoration and rehabilitation of the State park system and its natural, historical, and visitor serving resources; and the second is \$100 million for grants for nature education and research facilities and equipment.

The Department also has identified an additional funding opportunity of \$100 million in Proposition 1B funds, which can be used for port, harbor, and ferry terminal security improvements, however, the Sheriff's Department will be the lead agency on these projects which are enumerated on page 5.

**The Department will work with our Sacramento advocates and affected interest groups to support consideration of beaches under both parts of the Parks and Nature Education Facilities section.** Support is consistent with existing policy to include beaches in the definition of parks for the purpose of qualifying for park funding programs if the beaches are in densely populated urban areas. In past bond measures, broad language in the initiatives about funding clean beach projects was limited by the Legislature only to projects improving water quality.

Additionally, as the Department faces a multitude of regulatory and financial impediments in preparing for capital projects, DBH will work with our Sacramento advocates to **support guidelines for competitive grants that include realistic timeframes for eligible project submission and the expenditure of allocated program funding.**

### **Cross-Cutting Issues**

Priority Funding Sources. Proposition 1C includes \$850 million for infill incentives which can be used for water, sewer, or other infrastructure associated with transportation improvements, traffic mitigations, or brownfield cleanup that promotes infill. No more than \$200 million of these funds may be used for the development of new parks,

community centers, or the improvement or replacement of park facilities and equipment in support of existing or to be developed affordable housing.

There also is \$300 million for the Transit-Oriented Development Implementation Program which would provide grants to local governments, including transit agencies, for infrastructure necessary for the development of higher density uses within close proximity to transit station, and loans for the development and construction of housing in close proximity (1/4 mile) to a transit station. Fifteen percent of the housing units must be affordable to very low, or to low-income, households and to remain affordable for at least 55 years.

Efforts to obtain funding for infill incentives will be coordinated between CDC, DPW, DPR, and Regional Planning. It is anticipated that, depending on legislation and program regulations, the County might receive funding, including grants, for joint-use transit-oriented projects in or around the City of Glendale, the City of Industry, and the unincorporated area of East Los Angeles, as well as infill developments in other areas throughout unincorporated Los Angeles County.

Other potential cross cutting issues include the Integrated Regional Water Management Program for safe drinking water and water quality projects which could involve the Departments of Beaches and Harbors, Parks and Recreation, and Public Works, and the protection of beaches, bays, and coastal waters by the Departments of Beaches and Harbors and Parks and Recreation.